



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,069	12/29/2000	Ravindra R. Mantena	YOR920000555US1	9009

7590 12/14/2006
WAYNE F. REINKE, Esq.
HESLIN & ROTHENBERG, P.C.
5 CLUMBIA CIRCLE
ALBANY, NY 12203-5160

EXAMINER

LIPMAN, JACOB

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

DEC 14 2006

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/751,069
Filing Date: December 29, 2000
Appellant(s): MANTENA ET AL.

Wayne F. Reinke, Esq.
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 18 September 2006 appealing from the
Office action mailed 15 March 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

09/752,330, as identified by applicant

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

"Candle and AT&T Team up at SAPPHIRE Conference to Demonstrate Any-To-Any Application Integration For

Art Unit: 2134

SAP PU3 Applications Via the Web or Lotus Notes," Dialog File 20, Accession No.

02821200, PR Newswire, September 15, 1998.

Preston Gralla, How The Internet Works, 8/99, Macmillan Computer Publishing,
Millenium Edition, pgs 262-263

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, 10, 11, 14-17, 22-27, 29-35, 38, 39, 42-45, 50-55, 57-63, 66, 67, 70-73, 78-83, 85-91, 94, 95, 98-101, and 106-111, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by ERPNet, as disclosed in applicant's IDS as Dialog File 20, accession No. 02821200.

With regard to claims 1, 29, 57, and 85, ERPNet discloses a method for communicating between public (front-end) and private environments (back-end) (paragraph 6, beginning "using") including routing information from the public to the private environment (paragraph 7), obtaining a reply within the private environment, and returning the reply to the public environment (paragraph 8) in real time (paragraph 9).

With regard to claims 2, 30, 58, and 86 ERPNet discloses the back end is an ERP (SAP R/3).

With regard to claims 3-5, 31-33, 59-61, and 87-89, ERPNet discloses using middleware to communicate messages (MQSeries or MSMQ).

With regard to claims 6, 7, 10, 15, 16, 23, 34, 35, 38, 43, 44, 51, 62, 63, 66, 71, 72, 79, 90, 91, 94, 99, 100, and 107, ERPNet discloses that the front end can include a browser over the Internet (paragraph 6).

With regard to claims 11, 39, 67, and 95, ERPNet discloses tracking the communication (paragraph 9).

With regard to claims 14, 17, 42, 45, 70, 73, 98, and 101, ERPNet discloses sending the communication across a firewall (paragraph 14).

With regard to claims 22, 50, 78, and 106, ERPNet discloses sending the communication over a private network (VPN, paragraph 6).

With regard to claims 24-27, 52-55, 80-83, and 108-111, ERPNet discloses using SAP as the EPR and either MQSeries or MSMQ as the middleware (paragraph 6).

3. Claims 1, 29, 57, and 85, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gralla, in How The Internet Works.

With regard to claims 1, 29, 57, and 85, Gralla discloses communications between a public environment (internet) to a private environment (shopping site, bank), routing communication from the user in the public environment to the private environment (page 263 step 4) causing a reply to be produced in real time (step 5) and returning the reply to the user (step 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2134

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 18-21, 28, 36, 37, 40, 41, 46-49, 56, 64, 65, 68, 69, 74-77, 84, 92, 93, 96, 97, 102-105, and 112, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ERPNet.

With regard to claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 18-21, 36, 37, 40, 41, 46-49, 64, 65, 68, 69, 74-77, 92, 93, 96, 97, and 102-105, ERPNet discloses sending the information over the Internet as outlined above. ERPNet does not disclose encrypting the information. The examiner takes official notice that information sent over the Internet is frequently encrypted using SSL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to encrypt the data sent through ERPNet with SSL to improve security.

With regard to claims 28, 56, 84, and 112, ERPNet discloses using SAP as the ERP, but does not specifically mention BAAN. The examiner takes official notice that BAAN is a known ERP. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to communicate with a BAAN ERP using ERPNet's disclosed method for the disclosed motivation, "to reduce the time and effort required to conduct global industrial-strength business-to-business ERP transactions" (paragraph 2).

(10) Response to Argument

With regard to applicant's argument that ERPNet that no reply is generated in real time, the examiner points to paragraph 9, the first paragraph on the second page.

The disclosure states that ERPNet enables customers to monitor the flow of the four-city transaction. This means that at each point, a reply is sent back to the user to allow him to see the current status. The fact that the user is able to monitor it shows that it is accruing in real time. Each status update is a reply sent back to the public electronic environment.

With regard to applicant's argument that ERPNet does not disclose messaging middleware, the examiner points to paragraph 6, where ERPNet discloses it running over the internet, which is a network of middle computers sending messages.

With regard to applicant's argument that ERPNet discloses a Y2k firewall bouncing messages and not passing them, the examiner points out that the firewall only bounces messages that need Y2K repairing.


With regard to applicant's argument that Gralla does not teach routing the user's message, the examiner points to the credit card number of the user. This number is sent from the user, to the public environment, and then routed to a private environment to be verified. According to applicant's arguments that the verification is a new and totally unconnected communication, the transaction server would then itself read on a user, since it is using the bank for verification. Applicant further argues that the credit card number being sent is not a request for a credit check, but rather express or implied permission to check the credit card. The claim however does not stipulate what the user's intent is, just that the number is routed. Further the claim does not need to return the reply to the user, but only to the public environment, which Gralla clearly does.

With regard to applicant's argument that the reply of the bank is not sent to the user, the examiner again points out that this is not claimed. Further the examiner feels the reply of the bank is sent to the user when his order is accepted.

With regard to applicants argument that the private environment does not reply to the public environment, the examiner points out that the public environment includes the transaction server, and further that the reply is "returned" to the user in an e-mail in step 6.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.



Art Unit: 2134

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacob Lipman

JL *mi*

Conferees:

Gilberto Barron

GB

Matthew Smithers

MS

Gilberto R.
GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100